

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/806,653	03/23/2004	Bradley Emalfarb	00254P0077US	2587	
32116 75	90 02/22/2005		EXAMINER		
WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ, CLARK & MORTIMER			GORDON,	GORDON, RAEANN	
500 W. MADIS	ON STREET				
SUITE 3800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO, IL	60661		3711		
			DATE MAIL ED. 02/22/2004	•	

DATE MAILED: 02/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary							
		10/806,653	EMALFARB, BRADLEY				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
	The MAII INC DATE of this communication of	Raeann Gorden	3711				
Period fe	The MAILING DATE of this communication apor Reply	opears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
THE - External after - If the If No If No If Any	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 or SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a red period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by staturely received by the Office later than three months after the mailined patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)[[]	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29	November 2004					
-		is action is non-final.					
3)□	<i>,</i> —		esecution as to the merits is				
٥/ك	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
	·	Ex parte Quayre, 1955 C.D. 11, 45	0.0.210.				
Disposit	ion of Claims						
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Applicat	ion Papers						
_	·	oor					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
441	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 1) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
11)[_]	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received in Application	on No				
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri	ority documents have been receive	ed in this National Stage				
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* (* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachmen		_					
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate atent Application (PTO-152)				
	er No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:					

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 1 and 4, "the golf ball maintaining the first state while immersed in water up to the time period that is greater than two days but less than one hundred eighty day" is not supported by the originally filed specification.

Page 12, lines 3-4, discloses the performance characteristics preferably do not change with continuous immersion for up to two days. Applicant is precluded from now claiming a range from 2 to 180. Claims 11, the step of sensing the golf ball has the second characteristic is not supported by the originally filed specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winskowicz (6,358,160). Winskowicz discloses a golf ball that changes performance characteristics once immersed in water for several days (col. 2). The characteristics include weight, size, spherical symmetry, overall distance, and initial velocity (col. 10, claim 1). Winskowicz further discloses that it is well known that golf ball recovered after being exposed to water have a change in carry and coefficient of restitution (hardness) (col. 1). The golf balls are tested using golf clubs. See figure 1, where the golf ball is immerged into the water.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11-29-04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues the prior art identifies the problem that exists with respect to recovered ball in a completely different manner. As support applicant argues the performance changes in the ball of the prior art, Winskowicz, would not be detectable by a golfer. The Examiner disagrees. The prior art clearly discloses applicant's claimed invention. The prior art and the present invention disclose golf balls having a first characteristic and a different characteristic once immersed in water for several days. Applicant now claims the difference can be detected by a golfer and argues a golfer cannot detect the ball of Winskowicz without a visual indicator. As support applicant states a golfer cannot detect a 6 yard difference in carry. However, applicant is providing an opinion and not factual data. Winskowicz clearly discloses the golf ball in a

first state having predetermined characteristics prior to being immersed in water. The characteristics include weight, size, spherical symmetry, overall distance, and initial velocity. Once the golf ball is immersed in the water for several days the characteristics are different. While Winskowicz provides a visual indicator, the characteristics cited will clearly be detectable by a golfer.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raeann Gorden whose telephone number is 571-272-4409. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.

Art Unit: 3711

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Greg Vidovich can be reached on 571-272-4415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Rg February 10, 2005

PRIMARY EXAMINER